

March 14, 2005

MEMORANDUM TO: Luis A. Reyes  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Brian W. Sheron, Associate Director /RA/  
for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: FEBRUARY 2005 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*,  
SECTION 2.206

The attached reports give the status of petitions submitted under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.206. As of February 28, 2005, there were four open petitions that were accepted for review under the 2.206 process in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR).

Attachment 1 provides a detailed status of the open petitions.

Attachment 2 provides the status of incoming letters that the staff is reviewing to determine if they meet the criteria for review under the 2.206 process.

Attachment 3 shows the age statistics for the open 2.206 petitions as of February 28, 2005.

This report, Director's Decisions, and other 2.206-related documents are placed in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). In making these readily accessible to the public, the staff has identified another vehicle to address our performance goal of ensuring openness in our regulatory process.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: Donna Skay, NRR/DLPM  
415-1322

MEMORANDUM TO: Luis A. Reyes  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Brian W. Sheron, Associate Director /RA/  
for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: FEBRUARY 2005 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*,  
SECTION 2.206

The attached reports give the status of petitions submitted under Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.206. As of February 28, 2005, there were four open petitions that were accepted for review under the 2.206 process in the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR).

Attachment 1 provides a detailed status of the open petitions.

Attachment 2 provides the status of incoming letters that the staff is reviewing to determine if they meet the criteria for review under the 2.206 process.

Attachment 3 shows the age statistics for the open 2.206 petitions as of February 28, 2005.

This report, Director's Decisions, and other 2.206-related documents are placed in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS). In making these readily accessible to the public, the staff has identified another vehicle to address our performance goal of ensuring openness in our regulatory process.

Attachments: As stated

CONTACT: Donna Skay, NRR  
415-1322

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession Number: ML050600375

OFFICE	PM:PDI-1	LA:PDI-1	D:PDII	DD:DLPM	ADPT:NRR
NAME	DSkay	SLittle	HBerkow	JLyons	BSheron
DATE	03/07/05	03/07/05	03/07/05	03/09/05	03/10/05

OFFICIAL AGENCY RECORD

DISTRIBUTION FOR FEBRUARY 2005 REPORT ON THE STATUS OF PUBLIC PETITIONS  
UNDER TITLE 10 OF THE *CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS*, SECTION 2.206

Dated: March 14, 2005

PUBLIC

PDI-1 Reading File

EMerschoff, DEDR/ EDO

MVirgilio, DEDMRS/ EDO

PNorry, DEDM/ EDO

WKane, DEDH/ EDO

WDean, AO/ EDO

TBergman, OEDO

PAnderson, OEDO (Email after this document has been put into ADAMS)

EJulian

RLaufer

CHolden

JDyer, NRR

RBorchardt, NRR

BSheron, NRR

CMohrwinkel, NRR

KCyr, OGC

LChandler, OGC

SLewis, OGC

JCordes, Jr., OCAA

FCongel, OE

PLohaus, STP

JStrosnider, NMSS

PGoldberg, NMSS

CAbrams, NMSS

BBoger, NRR

GCaputo, OI

LMarsh, NRR

HBerkow, NRR

DSkay, NRR

OCA

OPA

OCM/DOC

Regional Administrators

SLittle

### **Status of Open Petitions**

<u>Facility</u>	<u>Petitioner/EDO No.</u>	<u>Page</u>
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	New England Coalition G20040284.....	1
All BWRs with Mark I and II containments	Nuclear Security Coalition G20040549.....	3
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	Paul Blanch and Arnold Gundersen G20050008.....	5
Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station	New England Coalition G20040831.....	6

## Report on Status of Public Petitions Under 10 CFR 2.206

---

Facility:	<u>Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station</u>
Petitioner:	Raymond Shadis, New England Coalition
Date of Petition:	April 22 and September 10, 2004
Director's Decision to be Issued by:	NRR
EDO Number:	G20040284
Proposed DD Issuance:	December 27, 2004
Final DD Issuance:	March 11, 2005
Last Contact with Petitioner:	December 27, 2004
Petition Manager:	Alan Wang
Case Attorney:	Stephen Lewis

### Issues/Actions requested:

That the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) order a halt to all fuel movement at Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Vermont Yankee) until such time as Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. (Entergy or the licensee) has rendered an accurate and NRC-verified account of the location, disposition, and condition of all irradiated fuel, including fuel currently loaded in the reactor core.

### Background:

On April 21, 2004, Vermont Yankee formally notified the NRC that two short spent fuel rod segments were not in the spent fuel pool (SFP) in the location specified in documents. The segments are described as about 7 inches long and 17 inches long, respectively. Both are approximately the diameter of a pencil. These segments had been placed in a special container at the bottom of the SFP in 1980. The licensee initiated an investigation to attempt to locate the missing segments. On May 19, 2004, Entergy reported to the NRC that the visual inspection of the SFP was essentially complete. A camera search of the SFP did not detect the unaccounted for spent fuel rod segments.

The NRC staff contacted the petitioner on April 28, 2004, to discuss the 2.206 process. Following this call, the NRC sent a letter to the petitioner notifying him that all fuel movements had been completed for the current refueling outage prior to the NRC's receipt of his petition. The staff concluded that the petitioner had not identified a safety concern that would prevent the plant from restarting.

The Petition Review Board (PRB) held a teleconference with the petitioner on May 5, 2004. During this teleconference, the petitioner clarified his request to exclude fuel movements associated with locating the missing fuel pin segments from the scope of his request. Following the teleconference, the PRB met in a closed session and determined that the petition satisfied the criteria for review under the 2.206 process. An acknowledgment letter was issued to the petitioner on May 28, 2004.

The NRC determined that its Director's Decision would be based partly on the actions taken by the licensee to locate the missing fuel. The NRC staff called the licensee on May 11, 2004, and discussed with them a request to document the actions they are

taking and the results of these actions. The requests discussed in this phone call are described in a letter to Entergy dated May 21, 2004. By letter dated June 8, 2004, Entergy submitted its response to the NRC's request.

On July 13, 2004, Entergy notified the NRC that the fuel rod segments had been located in the SFP. The pieces had been stored in a unique aluminum cylinder which was previously thought to be part of an existing in-pool structure.

The petitioner supplemented his petition on September 10, 2004. The supplement requested further verification of the current inventory of special nuclear material on site. The PRB held a second teleconference with the petitioner on September 22, 2004. Based on the new information in the supplement and additional requests for action, the NRC staff extended the expected completion date of its review to December 27, 2004.

On October 5, 2004, the NRC issued a letter to the licensee requesting specific information to assist in its review of the petition.

On October 25, 2004, the NRC issued a second acknowledgment letter to the petitioner in response to the supplement dated September 10, 2004, and subsequent teleconference.

On November 19, 2004, Entergy submitted a letter that provided information on its investigation in response to the NRC's request dated October 5, 2004.

The NRC issued a proposed Director's Decision for comment on December 27, 2004.

#### Current Status:

The NRC received comments on the proposed Director's Decision from the petitioner on January 25, 2005. The staff is reviewing the comments and expects to issue a final Decision by March 11, 2005.

Facility:	<u>All Boiling-Water Reactors (BWRs) with Mark I and II containments</u>
Petitioner:	Nuclear Security Coalition
Date of Petition:	August 10, 2004
Director's Decision to be Issued by:	NRR
EDO Number:	G20040549
Proposed DD Issuance:	June 10, 2005
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	February 15, 2005
Petition Manager:	Peter Tam
Case Attorney:	Stephen Lewis

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC:

- (1) Issue a demand for information to the licensees for all Mark I and II BWRs and conduct a 6-month study of options for addressing structural vulnerabilities;
- (2) Present the findings of the study at a national conference attended by all interested stakeholders, providing for transcribed comments and questions;
- (3) Develop a comprehensive plan that accounts for stakeholder concerns and addresses structural vulnerabilities of all Mark I and II BWRs within a 12-month period;
- (4) Issue Orders to the licensees for all Mark I and II BWRs compelling incorporation of a comprehensive set of protective measures, including structural protections; and
- (5) Make future operation of each Mark I and II BWR contingent on addressing its structural vulnerability with participation and oversight by a panel of local stakeholders.

Background:

The petitioners requested a teleconference to address the PRB. Due to difficulties in coordinating the availability of the petitioners, the teleconference was not scheduled until September 23, 2004. The teleconference was subsequently changed to a public meeting to accommodate petitioners who requested to be present.

Following the meeting on September 23, 2004, the PRB met in a closed session and determined that the petition satisfied the criteria for review under the 2.206 process. An acknowledgment letter was issued to the petitioners on October 19, 2004.

The staff determined that the response to the specific requests in the petition will be dependent on the NRC's response to a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report on fuel pool vulnerabilities. The PRB decided to suspend review of this petition, as of October 19, 2004, until the NAS report is issued publicly. The petitioner was notified of this action on November 22, 2004.

On November 29 and December 6, 2004, the petitioners submitted, via e-mail, supplemental information for their petition. The supplemental information consisted of media reports of potential terrorist targets.

On December 1, 2004, the NRC staff issued a letter to the petitioners stating that the NRC staff's effort to prepare a Director's Decision would proceed in parallel with NRC's efforts to respond to an NAS public report on the same subject. NRC is required by the FY 2005 Congressional appropriations language to respond to the NAS report. To do that, the NAS must first publish such a report. At that time, NAS was expected to issue a publicly available version of its report by December 31, 2004. However, as stated in a letter from the NRC to NAS on December 2, 2004, the publication of such a report was delayed due to differences between the NRC and NAS determination of the releasability of potential safeguards information in the report.

Current Status:

On 2/15, the Petition Manager notified the petitioner that the NAS report public version was not published on 12/31/04, as originally projected, and that the publication date is at currently expected to be spring 2005.



Facility:	<u>Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station</u>
Petitioner:	Paul Blanch and Arnold Gundersen
Date of Petition:	July 29, 2004 as supplemented on December 8, 2004
Director's Decision to be Issued by:	NRR
EDO Number:	G20050008
Proposed DD Issuance:	May 17, 2005
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	January 17, 2005
Petition Manager:	Donna Skay
Case Attorney:	Stephen Lewis

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC issue a Demand for Information requiring Entergy Nuclear Vermont Yankee, LLC and Entergy Nuclear Operations, Inc. to provide the NRC with information that describes how Vermont Yankee complies with the General Design Criteria.

Background:

By letter dated August 20, 2004, the NRC staff notified the petitioners that this request would not be treated under 2.206 because it involves a licensing action which is currently open for members of the public to request a hearing. Per the NRC's procedures, a request will not be treated under 2.206 if it can be resolved through the hearing process. Subsequent to being notified of this decision, the petitioners requested an opportunity to address the Petition Review Board. This teleconference was held on August 26, 2004.

In addition, on August 30, 2004, the New England Coalition filed a request for hearing on the Vermont Yankee power uprate. Among the contentions submitted was a contention that the licensee failed to maintain adequate documentation to determine design basis conformance.

On December 8, 2004, the petitioners sent a letter to Chairman Diaz requesting that he personally intervene in Entergy's application for an extended power uprate (EPU) amendment at Vermont Yankee (VY). The letter discusses issues related to the recent VY engineering inspection and concerns related to VY regulatory compliance. In an e-mail dated December 9, 2004, Mr. Blanch requested that this letter be considered as a supplement to his and Mr. Gundersen's 10 CFR 2.206 petition dated July 29, 2004.

On November 22, 2004, the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board ruled that the hearing contention related to this issue from the New England Coalition (supported by declaration from Mr. Blanch) was not admissible. The PRB held a meeting on December 14, 2004, and determined that the petition met the criteria of 10 CFR 2.206. The staff contacted the petitioners on December 16, 2004, and notified them that the petition had been accepted. An acknowledgment letter was sent to the petitioners on January 17, 2005.

Current Status:

The staff is reviewing the issues addressed in the petition and expects to issue a proposed Director's Decision by May 17, 2005.

Facility:	<u>Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station</u>
Petitioner:	Raymond Shadis, New England Coalition
Date of Petition:	December 7, 2004
Director's Decision to be Issued by:	NRR
EDO Number:	G20040831
Proposed DD Issuance:	May 26, 2005
Final DD Issuance:	TBD
Last Contact with Petitioner:	January 26, 2005
Petition Manager:	Rick Ennis
Case Attorney:	Stephen Lewis

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC order the shutdown of VY and/or take other such action as is within the NRC's discretion to restore reasonable assurance of adequate protection until such time as the licensee has provided a workable emergency warning or alert system and the NRC has verified its operability.

Background:

The petitioners state that the public warning system is inoperable and the licensee has established an extremely poor record in the area of emergency response.

In October 2004, the NRC conducted an inspection of the emergency preparedness program at VY and issued a preliminary white finding based on the failure to maintain the alert notification system.

The NRC held a teleconference with the licensee on January 6, 2005. Following this teleconference, the NRC determined that the petition met the criteria of 10 CFR 2.206 and sent an acknowledgment letter to the petitioner on January 26, 2005.

Current status:

The NRC staff is reviewing the petition with assistance from the Federal Emergency Management Agency. A proposed Director's Decision is expected to be issued by May 26, 2005.

## Status of Potential Petitions Under Consideration

---

Facility:	<u>All Operating Power Reactors</u>
Petitioners:	Legislature of Rockland County, Westchester County Board, Paul Gunter
Date of Petition:	February 10, February 22, and February 23, 2005
EDO Number:	GT 20050123, GT20050136, GT20050125
PRB meeting:	To be scheduled

### Issues/Actions requested:

1. Issue Generic Communications to all licensed commercial nuclear power station operators to ascertain whether operators currently provide emergency power backup system to significant elements of their required Emergency Notification Systems.
2. Modify all operating licenses to require that operators provide and maintain emergency backup electrical power to notification sirens, etc.

### Background:

The petitioners provided the following basis for their request:

- Nuclear power stations are not required to have emergency power backup for the ENS to assure the operation of public notification systems in the event of an accident or an act of sabotage associated with the simultaneous or subsequent failure of the electrical grid.
- An attack disabling offsite electrical power sources is assumed as part of the NRC Operational Safeguard Response Evaluations . Such an attack on the grid would disable the ENS at the reactors.
- NRC Daily Event Reports demonstrate how a variety of electrical grid failure modes have resulted in significant degradation of ENS.

### Current Status:

The staff will schedule a teleconference with the petitioners.

---

Facility:	<u>FitzPatrick</u>
Petitioner:	Citizens Awareness Network
Date of Petition:	October 27, 2004 as supplemented on November 16, 2004
EDO Number:	G20040743
PRB meeting:	December 7, 2004

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC modify or suspend the operating license for FitzPatrick until the following actions are completed:

1. Conduct physical tests of the ventilation and heat-up rates of the pump rooms under simulated fire scenarios, with verification of the test results by an independent third party, followed by an open public meeting;
2. Seal floor/ceiling penetrations between the basement level pump rooms and the first floor;
3. Provide alternate cooling and ventilation for Emergency Service Water (ESW) and Fire Safety Related Pump rooms; and
4. Verify the adequacy of completed actions by NRC inspection team.

Background:

The petition states that the former and current licensees have failed to fulfill commitments to resolve inadequate fire protection and ventilation affecting the ESW and Fire Safety Related Pump rooms.

On December 7, 2004, the PRB held a teleconference with the petitioners to clarify the issues raised in the petition and to determine if the petitioners had any additional information to support the basis for the petition. During the call, the petitioners stated that information was provided separately to the OIG from one of the petitioners and that the petitioners would like this information included as a supplement to the petition.

On December 17, 2004, the information provided to the OIG was made available to the PRB. This information is being reviewed by the staff to determine if it contains substantive new information beyond that previously evaluated.

Current Status:

The staff is continuing to review the information provided by the petitioners and previous NRC evaluations of the fire protection program at FitzPatrick to determine if there are any issues that have not been adequately addressed and require further evaluation.

Facility:	<u>Pilgrim</u>
Petitioner:	Mary Lampert
Date of Petition:	January 18, 2005
EDO Number:	G20050032
PRB meeting:	February 9, 2005

Issues/Actions requested:

That the NRC require Pilgrim to cease operations until proper notification equipment is installed throughout the Emergency Planning Zone to enable residents to transients to be notified within the required 15 minutes.

Background:

The petition provides the following as the basis for asserting that the public warning system at Pilgrim is ineffective:

1. The emergency sirens cannot be heard indoors; Pilgrim's EPZ should have an indoor warning system.
2. The emergency sirens have failed 12 times between 2000 and 2004.
3. Route notification takes considerably longer than 15 minutes and will not accomplish the task.
4. Sirens are not placed on major highways.

Current Status:

A teleconference with the petitioner was held on February 9, 2005. The petitioner provided additional information that was not contained in the 1/18/2005 letter during the teleconference. The staff is reviewing the additional information provided to determine whether the petition meets the criteria for acceptance under 2.206. These issues will require significant coordination with the Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response as well as with representatives from FEMA.

### AGE STATISTICS FOR AGENCY 2.206 PETITIONS

ASSIGNED ACTION OFFICE	FACILITY/ Petitioner	Incoming petition	PRB meeting <sup>1</sup>	Acknowledgment letter / days from incoming <sup>2</sup>	Proposed DD issuance Date/ age <sup>3</sup>	Date for final DD/ age <sup>4</sup>	Comments if not meeting the Agency's Completion Goals
NRR	All BWRs with Mark I and II containments	8/10/04	9/23/04	10/19/04 70	06/10/05		Due to scheduling difficulties, a meeting with the petitioner and licensee was delayed to 9/23/04.  The clock was stopped on this petition as of 10/19 until the NRC receives the report from NAS.
NRR	Vermont Yankee/ New England Coalition	4/22/04	5/11/04	5/28/04 36 10/25/04 45	<del>9/27/04</del> 12/27/04 63	03/11/05	The clock was reset due to receipt of supplement on 9/10/04
NRR	Vermont Yankee/ Blanch & Gundersen	7/29/04	8/26/04	01/17/05 172	05/17/05	TBD	The PRB could not enter this petition into the 2.206 process until the ASLB ruled on the admissibility of a related hearing contention.
NRR	Vermont Yankee/ New England Coalition	12/07/04	01/06/05	01/26/05 50	05/26/05	TBD	Due to scheduling conflicts, the PRB meeting with the petitioners could not be held until 4 weeks after the date of the petition. Following the meeting, the staff waited for the transcription of the meeting to be completed before issuing the acknowledgment letter.

- 1) Goal is to hold a PRB meeting, which the petitioner is invited to participate in, within 2 weeks of receipt of petition (there is often a delay of up to two weeks from the date that the letter is issued until it is received by the reviewing organization).
- 2) Goal is to issue acknowledgment letter within 5 weeks of the date of incoming petition.
- 3) Goal is to issue proposed DD within 120 days of the acknowledgment letter.
- 4) Goal is to issue final DD within 45 days of the end of the comment period.

